Ethnic Monitoring: Data Sources and Practices from GB

By Michelynn Laflèche[1]
For The Northern Ireland Council for Ethnic Minorities
February 2009

Table of Contents

Appendices

---

[1] Michelynn Laflèche is an independent research and policy consultant. She has over 20 years of experience of working on equality and diversity issues and was Director of the Runnymede Trust (www.runnymedetrust.org) from 2001 to 2008.

Background and Purpose

This briefing paper was commissioned by NICEM as background material to stimulate discussion amongst NI officials, invited experts, NICEM staff and Council Members and other stakeholders (15-20 delegates in total) on the issue and practice of ethnic monitoring. It focuses on GB experiences and practices to identify key data sources and measures/indicators used to test for and address racial discrimination and/or inequality. It also highlights practices employed by service providers to improve the quality of the administrative data on ethnicity they collect. It is intended to help the discussion begin to identify ethnic monitoring frameworks and practices appropriate to the Northern Ireland context and to expand the current Good Relations Baseline Indicators.[2]

The paper:

- Identifies key data sets, surveys and measures/indicators used by government departments to track, monitor and/or compare the experiences of BME groups, including new migrant groups (where possible);
- Outlines the stated practices of government departments in determining what data to collect and how to record it (frameworks);
- Provides case examples of ethnic monitoring practices to improve the quality of administrative data collected; and
- Considers the GB measures/indicators against the NI Good Relations/Racial Equality baseline indicators to identify gaps in the NI indicators.

Key areas of social policy and service delivery explored in this paper include:

- The criminal justice system
- Education
- Health
- Employment and training
- Participation
- Migration (new migrants)

The paper concludes with lessons from the examples and an extended list of suggested indicators to address racial equality issues more adequately, to be considered in the Northern Ireland context.

Why monitor by ethnicity?

Monitoring by ethnicity is not a new idea or practice in GB by any means. The 1991 Census introduced a question on ethnicity for the first time and since then some form of administrative data on ethnicity has been collected by government departments and public service providers. Until recently, the quality has been poor and the coverage patchy, and despite improvements seen in the last seven years, many significant challenges still remain.

With the implementation of the Race Relations (Amendment) Act (2000), a new imperative for ethnic monitoring data was established in order to meet the new public duties. The Commission for Racial Equality (now superseded by the Equality and Human Rights Commission) states the purpose of ethnic monitoring to be to "highlight possible inequalities; investigate their underlying causes; and remove any unfairness or disadvantage".[3] The guidance also outlines the case for monitoring by ethnicity succinctly: in relation to workforce, monitoring the ethnic make-up of the workforce enables comparisons and

---

[2] OFMDFM (January 2009) *Good Relations Indicators 2008 Update.* Belfast: OFMDFM.

[3] Commission for Racial Equality (2005) *Ethnic Monitoring: A guide for public authorities.* London: CRE. p.3.

benchmarking, and analysis of how personnel practices and procedures affect different ethnic groups. From a service delivery point of view, monitoring by ethnicity helps to identify the under- or over-representation of different racial groups (for example, in reporting problems, using services, or facing enforcement action); ensure satisfaction with a service, whatever a person's racial group; know how effectively a service is delivered to different communities; and, know how services are provided (for example, whether they take account of language or cultural needs, or the effects of past discrimination).

Many other guidance and other official documents make the case for monitoring and it is not the purpose of this paper to review and/or reiterate these here. It is worth noting at this early stage, however, that every department, public service provider and/or agency needs to make their own case for monitoring by ethnicity and communicate this loudly and clearly to their representatives, as is shown in the examples included here.

The Criminal Justice System

Under Section 95 of the Criminal Justice Act 1991, the Secretary of State is required to publish information annually to enable those involved in the CJS to avoid discrimination on grounds of race, sex or any other improper grounds. The s.95 reports focus on the experience of people from BME groups as victims, suspects, defendants and prisoners as well as as employees in the CJS. The most recent s.95 report to do with race is for the years 2006/7.[4] It covers:

- Victims and homicide
- Stops by the police
- Arrests and cautions
- Prosecutions and sentencing
- Youth offending
- Probation
- Prisons
- Complaints against the police, prison and probation services
- Deaths in custody
- Practitioners in the Criminal Justice System

The data and analysis presented in s.95 reports on race use largely the 4+1 or 5+1 census categories – White, Black, Asian, Other + Not Stated or White, Mixed, Black, Asian, Other + Not Stated – rather than the 16+1 categories. The Ministry of Justice argues that this is necessary because not all CJS agencies have reached a sufficient level of quality data collection using the 16+1 categories as yet, and therefore using the broad categories produces more robust data sets and reliable comparability.

Data for the s.95 reports comes from a variety of survey and administrative data sources. In terms of surveys, the British Crime Survey[5] is its principal source and administrative data is collected and analysed from all the CJS agencies – Police, CPS, Courts, Youth Justice Board, Probation and Prisons – as well as the Police Recorded Crime statistics. Data specifically on racist incidents/crime are

---

[4] Ministry of Justice (July 2008) *Statistics on Race and the Criminal Justice System – 2006/7. A Ministry of Justice publication under section 95 of the Criminal Justice Act 1991.* London: Home Office.

[5] The British Crime Survey (BCS) measures the amount of Crime in England and Wales. It collects information on crimes committed against individuals (personal crimes, including common assault, robbery, threats and wounding) and their property (household crimes, including thefts, vandalism and burglary). The BCS includes an attitudes survey of black and minority ethnic (BME) communities to assess their fears and perceptions of crime and where they think an incident has been racially motivated. Since 2001, it has been using the 16+1 census categories.

gathered from all police forces through HMIC, from courts through the CPS and from the British Crime Survey.

The CJS has been perhaps the most scrutinised in relation to its ethnic monitoring practices, initially as a result of the recommendations from the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry, but also due to the Race Relations (Amendment) Act (2000) and the resultant public duties, and recent investigations by the CRE. Although since 1 April 2003 all CJS agencies have been required to use the 16+1 categories in order to provide a single common system for collecting ethnic data consistent with the demographic information available from the Census (see Appendix 1a), progress at implementing this has been patchy and uneven.[6]

Case example: Developing the Minimum Data Set for the CJS

In response to patchy and uneven data in the CJS, the Office for Criminal Justice Reform (OCJR) conducted a root and branch review in 2005 and have now published and are working to support local CJS agencies in meeting its new Minimum Dataset (MDS), which maps out the management data that needs to be collected to performance manage the CJS in relation to race. The primary aim of the MDS is to enable practitioners and policy makers to:

- identify disproportionality in the CJS
- begin to understand the causes of disproportionality;
- performance manage the CJS in relation to race issues; and
- demonstrate accountability to BME communities.

At the time that the MDS was being agreed and developed, PSAs for the current spending period were also being defined and moving away from perception-based data to experience-based data. Key to the CJS is Indicator 4 of PSA 24, which aims to 'better identify and explain race disproportionality at key points within the CJS and have strategies in place to address racial disparities which cannot be objectively explained or justified.' The indicator has 3 main objectives:

- to improve collection and quality, especially the use of 16+1;
- to improve the use of the data and other diagnostic tools to understand over- or under-representation of BME people in the CJS; and
- to have robust and measurable strategies in place to address identified unjustified disproportionality that are jointly owned, implemented, monitored and reviewed by all agencies.

The MDS forms a significant component of the Indicator as it will supply a robust and good quality dataset to Local Criminal Justice Boards (LCJB) that will enable them to make an assessment of disproportionality at key decision points in the CJS. The MDS is a step forward from the Section 95 dataset – a legislative requirement that has grown incrementally as more datasets have become available but that has not been developed in a coherent fashion with a particular use for the data in mind apart from satisfying the legislative requirement.

The MDS was therefore developed by OCJR and an external contractor following the Root and Branch Review of race statistics undertaken in 2005 by the University of Portsmouth. The objective was to produce a dataset that would provide a useful resource to policy and decision makers. The MDS essentially consists of a series of individual tables that chart a suspect's, defendant's and offender's passage through the CJS, from stop/account through to living skills and drug treatment starts in prison, with each representing a particular decision point. These tables run concurrently so actually look like one large spreadsheet but it is important to remember that each table/decision point can be assessed in isolation.

---

[6] For detailed information on which CJS agencies have progressed towards using the standard 16+1 categories, see MOJ (July 2008), pp.3-7.

Each decision point is configured with an input and the associated outcomes: for example one input is Total for trial at Crown court with the associated outcomes being Not tried, Acquitted and Found guilty. Each item has a breakdown by ethnicity, which enables an assessment of whether, for example, black people are disproportionately found guilty in an LCJB area. (See Appendix 1b for a list of data items – inputs to each decision point are in bold.) In order to assist LCJBs, some of whom have a lack of capability in terms of data analysis, OCJR has developed an automated analysis tool that calculates both row (ethnic breakdown in each data item) and column percentages (outcome breakdown for each ethnicity), and uses confidence intervals to make an assessment of whether the observed data are higher or lower than would be expected through chance alone and hence whether disproportionality exists at a particular datum. It is important to note that disproportionality only, rather than whether it is justified or unjustified, is highlighted by the MDS. The justified/unjustified issue should be discussed by the LCJB: for example it is perfectly possible that significant levels of disproportionality in section 1 PACE stop/search could be derived from a specific, intelligence-led, operation.

The diagnostic tools and the basket of indicators are one and the same, and are based on the Practice Oriented Package (POP) developed by OCJR to address disproportionality in stop/search. They are designed to enable LCJBs to understand the drivers behind disproportionality and as such to take steps to address it. The diagnostic tools currently being developed are around employment and bail, and the POP is already available for LCJBs/forces to use.

The MDS enables LCJBs to performance manage race issues in their constituent agencies but does not directly tackle collection issues. The MDS may identify them but due to the nature of PSA 24 it is not for OCJR to dictate how collection should be improved. The ethos of the PSA is local delivery rather than proscriptive top-down targets, so that areas are able to tailor solutions that will work in their area.

In terms of improving data collection, there are two separate issues – firstly the actual collection of data by the individual police/probation/YOT/prison officer, but also the systems in place to transfer case details to different parts of the CJS. A particular problem in England and Wales is the police to courts link – in the latest Section 95 report only 7 out of 43 areas have sufficiently good quality magistrates court proceedings data to be published; the situation is better, although by no means perfect, for Crown courts.

(Case example text provided by Simon Denison, Office for Criminal Justice Reform – Race and Confidence Unit, February 2009)

Education

Education is also an area where a significant amount of monitoring data by ethnicity is collected and analysed regularly. Schools in England have collected information on the ethnic background of their pupils since 1990 and have a statutory obligation to provide information to the DCSF through the Pupil Level Annual Schools' Census (PLASC) carried out each January.[7] It is also a requirement of the Race Relations (Amendment) Act (2000) that schools and Local Authorities ensure that all pupils are given equality of opportunity to succeed and to meet their potential and there is a duty on schools to monitor and assess how their policies affect ethnic minority pupils, staff and parents.

Broadly speaking, ethnic monitoring is used in the education field in England and Wales as a tool for comparing the performance of different ethnic groups and assessing the needs of those who seem to be underachieving. Specifically, Local Authorities and the DCSF use local and national data to analyse trends in performance, make comparisons, set meaningful targets for performance or improvement and to deploy resources effectively. Schools use the data to:

- see how well different groups perform at different stages while at school;
- monitor other experiences such as attendance and exclusions from school to make sure that all pupils are treated fairly and that no single group is missing out on or is not attending school;
- monitor and improve their own practices and also celebrate the success achieved by their pupils; and
- respond better to underlying needs or patterns of attainment that may be common to some groups of pupils as well as those that are common to all.

Helpfully, the Department for Education and Skills published a detailed report biennially on the subject, the last one in July 2006.[8] Topics covered included: details on the minority ethnic school population; attainment and progress of minority ethnic pupils (compared to previous years); exclusions and attendance data; segregation; attitudes toward school and research evidence from various strategies aimed at raising the attainment and inclusion of minority ethnic pupils; and, ethnic background of teachers.

Focusing on England, the ethnic groups covered in that overview topic paper focuses on pupils of White Other, Black Caribbean, Black African, Black Other, Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Chinese, Mixed White & Black Caribbean and Mixed White & Black African and Chinese heritage. Where appropriate, children and young people of White Irish, Gypsy/Roma and Traveller of Irish Heritage origin are discussed, as well as some of the ‘extended’ codes used by some LEAs in the Pupil Level Annual School Census. It also includes information on pupils for whom English is an Additional Language (EAL).

The key data sources include the Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC; through which ethnicity data on all pupils is collected annually), Department generated statistics and Department sponsored

---

[7] The introduction of the Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC) in January 2002 allowed for different data to be linked. This made it possible for achievement data to be linked to ethnic background data on a national basis for the first time.

[8] Department for Education and Skills (July 2006) *Ethnicity and Education: The Evidence on Minority Ethnic Pupils aged 5–16. Research Topic Paper: 2006 edition.* London: DfES. The DCSF does not plan to produce a new issue of this Topic Report, but rather include ethnicity data in a broader report on narrowing the gap; the timeline is not yet known however. Ethnicity data are still available to the public in the Department’s Statistical First Releases on their website, as well as there continuing to be Topic Reports on specific groups, most recently on Gypsy and Travellers, see: Department for Children, Schools and Families (2008) *The National Strategies: Raising the Achievement of Gypsy, Roma and Traveller Pupils*. London: DCSF.

studies including the Longitudinal Study of Young People in Education. The collection of administrative ethnic monitoring data has steadily improved since the introduction of ethnic monitoring codes. The percentage of 'unclassified' pupils in primary schools has decreased from 2.3% in 2004 to 1.9% in 2005 and 1.4% in 2006. In secondary it has decreased from 3.4% in 2004 to 2.9% in 2005 and 2.3% in 2006.[9]

Significantly, 'extended' ethnicity codes (70 in total) are permitted in the PLASC for many of the main ethnic codes, including White British, White Other, White & Asian, Other Mixed Heritage, Pakistani, Black African, Black Other, Chinese and Other. It is noteworthy that the extended code sets used most were for White Other (49 LAs), Other (37 LAs) and Black African sets of codes (28 LAs), reflecting the increase in new migrant groups to the areas concerned. (See Appendix 2a for the standard code form and Appendix 2b for a full list of extended codes and descriptions.)

Case example: Improving Data Quality – West Sussex Children's Services

Despite the requirement on schools to collect administrative ethnicity data on all pupils, availability of guidance available to schools and Local Authorities on how to do so,[10] and reducing percentages of 'unclassified' pupils nationally, some geographic areas and individual schools continue to face real challenges in meeting their obligations. West Sussex Local Authority has been able to increase the rate and improve the quality of ethnicity data returned at school level by taking a purposeful, multi-agency approach.

With what appeared to be an increasing number of new migrant arrivals into the area, affecting both the delivery of services and resulting in some community tensions, it was essential for the Local Authority to have a clear picture of what was happening. The education services in West Sussex were first to recognise the challenge. However, the PLASC data did not give them sufficient information about where new arrivals were settling or why, but the New Arrivals Referral Service did suggest settlement trends and hence suggested the way forward – the appointment of two Home School Liaison Officers to work on the ground to identify changing needs at family and individual level and provide a link-up with other public service provision in the area. The effect of the increased cross-agency communication with two new staff posts was powerful, and in one area (Littlehampton-Bognor Regis), where there was a higher number of new migrants arriving, the District Council recognised the need for similar provision and appointed an Outreach Worker to complement the functions of the HSLO in the other public service areas.

Having better intelligence about the changing population make-up and the different groups' individual needs enabled the Local Authority to develop appropriate training at school level (and in other services) on the collection of monitoring data. Importantly, it was the training that made the difference in the quality and rate of data collection because the training allowed teachers and other school representatives to see clearly how ethnicity monitoring data connected directly to the provision of

---

[9] DfES (July 2006) p.4

[10] See for example: Data Collection FAQs at http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/ethnicminorities/faqs/763517/#2; Department for Education and Skills (January 2002) *Guidance for Local Education Authorities on schools' collection and recording data on pupils' ethnic background (in compliance with the Data Protection Act and the 2001 national population Census),* Ref: DfES 0002/2002. Superseded documents: DES Circular 16/89; for extended guidance on collecting ethnicity data in relation to education see http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/ethnicminorities/collecting/763919/; for specific guidance relating to Gypsies, Roma and Travellers see Department for Children, Schools and Families (2008) *The Inclusion of Gypsy, Roma and Traveller Children and Young People/Pupils: strategies for building confidence in voluntary self-declared ethnicity ascription.* London: DCSF.

individual learning and development plans for each pupil, a key plank of current education policy. The training also gave individual teachers/officers both the confidence and a range of tools to enable them to ask pupils/parents to self-ascribe ethnicity as well as to employ appropriate proxy indicators, such as languages spoken at home, to improve the data quality.

(Text for case example generated from a telephone interview with Hazel Squires, Associate Adviser: Equality and Diversity (BME and GRT pupils), Adults and Children, Learning, West Sussex County Council, February 2009)

Health

The Department of Health has collected ethnicity information from the NHS about the workforce since 1991 and about patients since 1995. From April 2001, the Department of Health and the NHS have used the 16+1 ethnic categories, bringing their standard data collection framework in line with the categories used in the 2001 Census. To take account of the local population and needs, local managers are permitted to breakdown ethnic classifications further, so long as the more detailed data re-aggregate to the national standard. (See Appendix 3 for the "Ethnic Classifications - Optional detailed framework" for the NHS/DH.) Self-ascription of ethnic group is an essential principle in the NHS/DH.

The main data sets that are required to collect data using the 16+1 categories are:
- Admitted Patient Care Commissioning Data Set (CMDSs);
- Hospital Episode Statistics (the key source of national comparative data on healthcare delivery and performance in England);
- Referrals, Assessments and Packages of Care (RAP); and,
- NHS Workforce Census data collections.

In addition, and in line with the Race Equality Public Duty, ethnic group data should be collected as part of comprehensive patient profiles that include other demographic and needs-based information at the primary care level; NHS Direct has included ethnicity monitoring as part of callers' demographic information since 2003; and, the first annual census, "Count me in", of the ethnicity of psychiatric in-patients, organised by the Mental Health Act Commission with the National Institute for Mental Health in England and the Healthcare Commission, took place in March 2005.

Other sources of key information available to complement/enhance administrative collection of ethnicity data and improve the targeting of health policies include the annual Health Survey for England (HSE) and Health Statistics Quarterly. The HSE focuses on a different demographic group each year, along with its repeating core sample. The most recent focus on minority ethnic groups was published in April 2006 and covered health indicators including cardio-vascular disease, physical activity, oral health, accidents, and asthma. It also covered behavioural risk factors associated with cardio-vascular disease like drinking, smoking and eating habits and health status risk factors like diabetes, blood pressure, and cholesterol. For children the emphasis was on respiratory health. Findings from self-reported health and psychological well-being, as well as use of complementary or alternative medicine, were also analysed.[11]

The importance or benefits of collecting and analysing ethnicity data (or ethnic monitoring, in other words) for the Department of Health and the NHS broadly mirror those already highlighted for other social policy and service delivery areas. The main objective is to "make things more equitable and

---

[11] Sproston, Kerry and Mindell, Jennifer (eds.) (2006) *Health Survey for England 2004: The health of minority ethnic groups.* London: The Information Centre for Health and Social Care. More general information about the Health Survey for England is available at http://www.ic.nhs.uk/statistics-and-data-collections/health-and-lifestyles-related-surveys/health-survey-for-england

appropriate for
patients, service users, communities and staff." Specific benefits of ethnic monitoring identified for patients and service users include: improved uptake of and design of accessible and sensitive/appropriate services; provision of targeted clinical services for specific needs of specific groups (i.e. screening for sickle cell); and, determining health outcomes – for example by linking patterns of morbidity to specific black and minority ethnic groups. At a national/policy level, ethnic monitoring data is useful to: policy development, monitoring and evaluation; resource acquisition and distribution; accountability to the public and Parliament; NHS local and national management; performance management of the NHS; public health support; and, research and statistics. In particular, it is needed to identify trends over time, variations across geographic areas and organisations, and health inequalities.

An internal Department of Health review of centrally collected ethnic origin information conducted in 2000/01 found that it was generally of poor quality, and concluded that this was mainly due to low response/coverage rates or because incorrect information was being provided. Various reasons were suggested for this poor data quality, including:

- 'data suppliers not seeing race information being used centrally by the Department;
- patchy use of race information at the local level;
- clients/patients/employees unwilling to categorise themselves because of uncertainty about why this information is being requested;
- data collectors reluctant to ask for ethnic information because it is felt to be an emotive issue; and
- ambiguity about who should be responsible for reporting ethnicity, particularly when dealing with groups such as children or mental health clients.'[12]

In its 2005 *Guidance on Ethnic Monitoring*, the Department of Health acknowledged that a key driver to improving the quality of ethnic monitoring data collected was the introduction of a specific data quality indicator in the Hospital Performance Ratings measure that included ethnicity data as a component, first in 2001/2, then further specified and broken down in 2003/4 to included a discrete ethnicity data indicator covering both HES data and workforce data.[13]

Case example: Patient Profiling Initiative, Liverpool Central PCT
The way in which the Patient Profiling Initiative at Liverpool Central PCT collects data has been commended by The Commission for Racial Equality as the gold standard for ethnicity monitoring in primary care. In 2005 Patient Profiling at Liverpool PCT was highlighted as a good practice example in the Department of Health document 'A Practical Guide to Ethnicity Monitoring'.

In the past practices had been supported with mailing, printing costs and data entry. However, due to the inclusion of ethnicity data collection as part of the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF), rising postal and printing costs and the fact it would take another four to five years to profile these practices, it was decided to encourage the practices to consider collecting the information for themselves.

The QOF requires practices to collect a patient's ethnicity as they register. Other than this there is very little incentive for the practices to become involved with collecting data over and above ethnicity from all of their patients. The 56 practices were individually visited and were offered the tools to facilitate data collection. Each practice was given 400 patient information forms (PIFs) to collect the data, an information pack, a template to enter data onto the clinical system, and training around how to do so, as

---

[12] Department of Health (2001) *Collecting Ethnic Category Data: Guidance and Training Material for implementation of the new ethnic categories From April 2001 (Revised October 2001).* London: DoH. pp.17.

[13] Department of Health/Health and Social Care Information Centre/NHS Employers (29 July 2005) *A Practical Guide to Ethnic Monitoring in the NHS and Social Care.* London: Department of Health. pp.13.

well as training about the need for profiling data.

53 practices agreed to participate in profiling at the time they were approached. Which patients they profiled varied across the practices - some would only consider collecting the extra data from their new registrations, others agreed to do this and also to undertake the profiling of patients on their disease registers. Just under 20 practices said they would target all their patients.

Results:

- Having ethnicity included in a disease register template triggers the collection of this information. It should be considered a priority that religion and spoken language should be included in disease register templates.
- The higher percentage of recording of ethnic group suggests that there has been an impact due to the QOF identification of the need for this data.
- Adding more ethnic group codes to the templates to better reflect the perceived population of Liverpool has been effective:
    - The Patient Profiling Team has recently been successful in requesting a Yemeni ethnicity code. The Liverpool PCT area has a large Yemeni community and it was felt that the local code in use needed to be replaced.
    - With the addition of the codes onto the templates they are able to identify ethnic categories such as Polish and Czech which would have otherwise been coded under a general Other White code. Although this gives a much better breakdown of ethnic groups at a local level it can also be easily aggregated back up to compare to other standard data sets such as Census data.
    - There are some codes that confuse the issue. Codes such as “British mixed British” do little to help.

(Case example text extracted from *Patient Profiling Report 2007. Liverpool Central Primary Care Trust* provided for use in this briefing paper by Pauline Mitchell, Equality Data Manager, LCPCT. See also Department of Health (August 2008) *Equality and Human Rights Case Study: Liverpool: Patient Profiling.*)

Employment and Training

Measuring the recruitment, retention and progression of staff is an essential component of promoting race equality. The Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 placed specific duties on public authorities in GB to monitor employment practices. The elements to be monitored in relation to employment are listed on pages XX of this briefing paper and represent the minimum standards required to meet both the specific and general duties. They are an excellent starting point for any organisation, public or private, to develop a comprehensive list of monitoring data items.

In terms of administrative data collection and sources, there are many examples of practices across government departments and public service providers. Already mentioned above is the NHS Workforce Census, for example. The Criminal Justice System also has targeted measures on employment, as outlined in the Home Secretary’s Employment Targets. Following from the recommendations of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry report, these targets were introduced in 1999 and are an essential tool for both the Home Office in meeting its race equality duties and performance management **and** for the public to hold the Home Office to account. The targets were based on four principles, the adoption of which would benefit any organisation committed to achieving race equality in their workforces:

- ‘targets need to reflect the local circumstances facing the service concerned. National and local issues, where relevant, would need to be taken into account

- targets should be set on the basis of outcomes that would be expected assuming systems were fair
- there needed to be recognition that proper progress could only be achieved over time and this would be reflected in the ten-year timetable set for achieving the changes
- there should be fixed milestones at three and five years against which progress could be reviewed.'[14]

The Learning and Skills Council developed a Race Equality in Employment Standard (REES) following the recommendations of its Commission for Black Staff in Further Education.[15] It is designed to offer 'LSC delivery partners a simple and coherent framework for embedding good race equality practice into employment and human resource (HR) functions across their organisation.'

Case example: Using General Staff Surveys to Collect Ethnicity Data

A key challenge faced by many employers is how to collect of good quality ethnicity administrative data on their workforces. Employers often report that staff members are unwilling to complete ethnicity questions because they don't know how the material will be used or are suspicious of how it might be used.

A PCDL college found that it obtained a poor response from a staff survey which was specifically on ethnicity. On discussing this problem with other providers as part of the REES pilot process, the college undertook a more comprehensive staff survey which included a question on ethnicity. The response was greater because staff felt that ethnicity was not the main issue, but was just one question amongst a range of questions.

(PCDL case example extracted from Learning and Skills Council (2006) *Race Equality in Employment Standard*. Coventry: LSC, paragraph 22)

Private sector employers are not bound by the public duties. There is, however, pressure on private sector employers to monitor the ethnicity of their workforces to ensure that they do not discriminate and more and more pressure is being place on private sector employers to actively promote race equality in their organisations, for example through public procurement/contract compliance approaches.

Over the last 10 years there have been four major reports examining race equality in the private sector in GB (mostly in England).[16] All of these reports have concluded that little progress has been made by private sector employers in reducing the gap in employment rates between BME groups and White groups, or in eradicating the so-called ethnic penalty. All also suggested that the way forward is to allow private sectors employers a set period of years (most often 5 years is recommended) to address the situation voluntarily or face the prospect of legislation or other forms of compulsion. No compulsion has been forthcoming, despite the first of these recommendations being made in 1999. Very little progress has also been made. The most recent of these reports (NEP 2007) suggests that the lack of progress is a direct result of 'a lack of priority and accountability.'(p.19) The report goes on to say 'It is a truism, but

---

[14] Home Office (December 2008) *Race Equality. The Home Secretary's Employment Targets. Report 2007/08. Ninth Annual Report. Staff targets for the Home Office, the Police, Identity & Passport Service, UK Border Agency and Criminal Records Bureau.* London: Home Office. p.5.

[15] Learning and Skills Council (2006) *Race Equality in Employment Standard*. Coventry: LSC.

[16] Better Regulation Task Force (1999) *Review of anti-discrimination legislation.*London: BRTF. Cabinet Office (2003) *Ethnic minorities and the Labour Market*. Final Report. London: TSO. Task Force on Race Equality and Diversity in the Private Sector (2004) *Race Equality: the benefits for responsible business.* London: IPPR. National Employment Panel (October 2007) *The Business Commission on Race Equality in the Workplace: A report by the National Employment Panel.* London: NEP/DWP.

nonetheless true,
that "you get what you measure". This is a principal reason why the ethnic minority employment gap is still sixteen percentage points. There is no over-arching goal towards which everyone can progress. There are no interim milestones for which organisations can be held accountable. And there is insufficient knowledge of the detail of discrimination to support change.'(p.21) A rallying call for ethnic monitoring – data collection and analysis – if ever there was one!

More broadly, beyond the census data available on employment/training and ethnicity, other key sources with ethnic booster samples include:

- Annual Local Area Labour Force Survey (UK), covering the labour market, education, training, demographic characteristics and local area estimates
- Quarterly Labour Force Survey (UK), covering the labour market, education, training and demographic characteristics
- ONS Longitudinal Study (England and Wales), covering, among other things, occupational mobility
- Youth Cohort Study (England and Wales) covering GCSE & A level qualification attainment, participation in fulltime education and training, Employment circumstances after leaving school
- Longitudinal Study of Young People (England) covering education, training and employment, family and relationships, leisure activities and interests, health and lifestyle.

Participation

The Department for Communities and Local Government conducts the Citizenship Survey,[17] which reports headline figures quarterly, and produces an annual report in the autumn (i.e. April 2008 to March 2009 full annual report will be published in Autumn 2009). The Citizenship Survey is a household survey (sample size 10,000, with a minority ethnic boost sample of 5,000) and data is collected by face-to-face interviews. The questions are largely perceptions-based.

The survey covers a wide range of issues relevant to key PSA targets and other Department Strategic Objectives, in particular the Cohesive, Empowered and Active Communities Public Service Agreement (PSA 21) and the Equalities Public Service Agreement (PSA 15).[18] For example, the most recent quarterly report (published 29 January 2009) covers:

- Empowered and active communities
    - Influencing decisions (PSA 21, Indicator 4; DSO 1, Indicator 2)
    - Civic engagement
    - Volunteering (PSA 21, Indicator 5)
- Community cohesion
    - Cohesion (PSA 21, Indicator 1; DSO 4, Indicator 1)

---

[17] For the most recent quarterly report see Department for Communities and Local Government (29 January 2009) *Citizenship Survey April – September 2008, England. Cohesion Research Statistical Release 6.* London: DCLG.

[18] **PSA 21 – Build more cohesive, empowered and active communities**
- Percentage of people who believe that people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area (Indicator 1)
- Percentage of people who have meaningful interactions on a regular basis with people from different ethnic or religious backgrounds (Indicator 2)
- Percentage of people who feel that they belong to their neighbourhood (Indicator 3)
- Percentage of people who feel they can influence decisions affecting their local area (Indicator 4)
- Percentage of people who engage in formal volunteering on a regular basis (at least once a month) (Indicator 5i).

PSA 15 – Address the disadvantage that individuals experience because of their gender, race, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion or belief
- Differential gaps in participation in civic society (Indicator 3)
- Differential gaps in perception of employment based discrimination (Indicator 4)
- Differential gaps in perceptions of dignity and respect when accessing services (Indicator 5).

  - Belonging (PSA 21, Indicator 3; DSO 4, Indicator 3)
  - Satisfaction with local area (DSO1, Indicator 1)
  - Meaningful interaction with people from different backgrounds (PSA 21, Indicator 2; DSO 4, Indicator 2)
- Prejudice and discrimination
  - Racial or religious harassment (DSO4, Indicator 5)
  - Labour market discrimination (England and Wales)

Migration (New Migrant Groups)

The arrival of new migrant groups into all parts of the UK is posing challenges for many local authorities in determining appropriate services and in addressing discrimination, inequality and tensions/conflicts between new arrivals and indigenous/established groups. The Local Government Association recently published a guide that brings together in one document the myriad sources currently available.[19] It also assesses the quality of the data sources and their usefulness to local planning and provides a range of examples of how different local authorities and service providers have built up estimates of migrant populations using a range of official and administrative data sources, as well as means for gathering local intelligence.

Of particular interest, but not yet available to the public, is the New Migrant Databank.[20] Its 'combines alternative sources of international migration data into a common structure, providing consistent data reporting, a common view of the patterns and trends evident at national, regional and local authority level and the basis for further research and analysis into methods for improved estimation of immigration and emigration.' Data sources used to compile the Databank include:

- Total International Migration (TIM) estimates
- National Insurance Number (NINo) registrations from the National Insurance Recording System (&IRS)
- GP registration statistics provided by ONS
- Workers Registration Scheme (WRS) statistics
- international student numbers from the Higher Education Statistics Authority (HESA)
- Labour Force Survey (LFS) statistics.

The 2011 Census will include a question on migration, which will help establish a baseline for monitoring migration. The proposed migration topics for England and Wales are:

- Country of birth
- Usual address one year ago
- Month and year of arrival to the UK
- Citizenship
- Intended length of stay in the UK

Lessons from the GB Experience

---

[19] Green, Anne E, Owen, David and Duncan, Allan (November 2008) *A Resource Guide on Local Migration Statistics*. London: Local Government Association.

[20] Boden, Peter and Rees, Phil (2008) *New Migrant Databank: Concept, development and preliminary analysis.* Paper to be presented at a QMSS2 seminar Estimation and Projection of International Migration, University of Southampton, 17-19 September 2008.

The material presented here is, as stated at the start, GB specific. But there are common lessons that apply to any social/legal context that should be noted:

- A standardized framework is essential
    - Incrementally / organically developed monitoring frameworks are not fit for purpose
    - Data items need to work with national statistical categories – i.e. census categories – so they can be appropriately aggregated and disaggregated as needed
    - A framework needs to offer flexibility for adaptation (i.e. extended codes) for different service providers and different/local contexts, without diluting the minimum data requirements
- Significant resources need to be invested into developing, testing and implementing a standardized framework – this should include consultation with communities as well as service providers
- High-level leadership is needed to demonstrate a government/public service-wide commitment to ethnic data collection and monitoring
    - Service specific cases for ethnic monitoring need to be made and communicated to staff and service clients/users
- Formal performance measurements (i.e. data quality targets) reap better results and do so more quickly – accountability, in other words
- Targets, linked to outcomes, need to be set and milestones set, all of which need to be widely communicated to staff and to the public
- Including an ethnicity question in a range of forms/settings improves the rate and quality of data collection (i.e. on disease register templates, as well as patient registration forms; general staff surveys rather than only surveys to do with 'ethnicity')
- Who in each and every public service unit is responsible for collecting administrative ethnic monitoring data needs to be clear and known to all staff
- Staff responsible for collecting administrative monitoring data need good quality and regular training
    - Confidence to ask sensitive questions needs to be built for staff at all levels – from reception to management
    - Ability to instruct and persuade service clients/users to self-ascribe needs to be taught to staff
    - Staff need to know, understand and see how the data are used to get their buy-in and so they can explain this to service clients/users and colleagues
- Monitoring reports need to be published making regular use of the monitoring data so staff and service client/users see the benefits
- On the ground intelligence is necessary to identify new patterns/new groups not captured by other means – for example, liaison officers
- Social Surveys (and others) need to include ethnic identification questions, ethnic booster samples and present data analysed by ethnicity – on a regular basis
    - Significant resources need to be invested to expanding existing surveys or to creating new ones

The Good Relations Indicators – Gaps and Ways Forward

A Race Equality Strategy for Northern Ireland (2005-2010) (RES) was published in July 2005[21] in which government acknowledged the need for and made commitments to improving and increasing administrative data collection on ethnicity, along with other race equality monitoring commitments to

---

[21] OFMDFM (July 2005) *A Race Equality Strategy for Northern Ireland (2005-2010)*. Belfast: OFMDFM. p.7.

increase knowledge
about and improve service delivery to BME communities in Northern Ireland. Earlier in 2005 *A Shared Future* was also published. A decision was taken to develop Good Relations Indicators that would address both strategies together and in January 2007 the *Good Relations Indicators Baseline Report* was published outlining 11 'priority outcomes' (see Table 1 for their relationship to the RES and *A Shared Future*).

A range of indicators were developed for 9 of the 11 priority outcomes and baseline data was gathered, analysed and presented in the January 2007 report. Indicators for two of the priority outcome areas – PO10 (Victims/survivors have a voice) and PO11 (Public service delivery in NI provides value for money on a shared, inclusive and equal basis), both of which have particular relevance for BME groups and Aims 1, 2, 3 and 6 of the RES – were not published in January 2007 because OFMDFM stated that it was waiting on the results of other research and strategy objectives due later in that year. However, by January 2009, with the publication of the *Good Relations Indicators 2008 Update*,[22] indicators for these two priority outcomes had still not been developed.

---

[22] OFMDFM (January 2009) *Good Relations Indicators 2008 Update.* Belfast: OFMDFM.